

April 19, 2006

REMARKS

Applicants hereby elect the claims of the Group I coating powder composition, claims 1-6, with traverse.

The restriction requirement is at least partly improper. If a search of the entire invention can be made without putting a serious burden on the Examiner, the Examiner must search that entire invention. See MPEP 803. In the instant case, a search of the method of using the coating powder (Group II, claims 7-10) and of the composition (Group I, claims 1-6) would not put an undue burden on the Examiner, adding only a single subclass of art in Class 427, subclass 195. See *Manual of Patent Classification*. This search does not create a serious burden on the Examiner. Even notwithstanding the lack of a serious search burden on the Examiner, the claims of Groups I and II, respectively, recite the same invention: A composition and a method of using the same composition. See *In re Ochiai*, 37 USPQ2d 1127 (Fed Cir. 1995). Accordingly, the claims of Groups I and II should be examined together. Applicants hereby request rejoinder of the process of use, Group II, claims 7-10 with the composition claims of Group I, claims 1-6.

The Applicants respectfully request the reconsideration and the withdrawal of all art restriction requirements.

Response to Restriction...
U.S.S.N. 10/615,685


April 19, 2006

Conclusion

Based on the foregoing, it is submitted that the instant claims 1-11 define a single invention and are presently in condition for allowance in the instant application.

If any fees are found owing, please charge our deposit account no. 18-1850. If the Examiner has any questions or concerns, he is urged to contact the undersigned at the number given below.

Respectfully submitted,



Andrew E.C. Merriam
(Reg. No. 47,268)

ROHM and HAAS Company
100 Independence Mall West
Philadelphia, PA 19106
215-592-6758
April 19, 2006